DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 168 052 CS 204 757

AUTHOR Parker, Robert P.; Newton, Bryan
TITLE Writing in the Learning of Humanities: An Institute.
PUB DATE [78]
NOTE 30p.; Report prepared at Rutgers, The State University ; Best copy available

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Composition (Literary); Higher Education; Humanistic Education; Humanities; *Humanities Instruction; *Inservice Teacher Education; Institutes (Training Programs); Interaction; Interdisciplinary Approach; *Learning Processes; *Summer Institutes

ABSTRACT

A three-week institute at Rutgers University during the summer of 1977 attracted 49 college-level teachers representing a wide range of academic subjects. Organizers of the institute sought to involve these people in an intensive study of the numerous inherent possibilities for learning that writing activities offer to any subject area. The activities at the institute included comparing evaluations of student writing samples, listening to invited speakers, brainstorming about the synergistic reaction between writing activities and content area subject matter, and discussing techniques that combine writing with content learning. Following the institute, most participants moved to implement the ideas they encountered at these sessions; and 35 of them provided descriptions of "follow-up" work directly attributable to participation in the institute. These reports reflect changes in their approach to writing instruction, changes in their own writing habits, and their efforts to involve others in the writing behaviors and writing attitudes that the institute promoted. (RL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED168052

WRITING IN THE LEARNING OF HUMANITIES:

AN INSTITUTE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Robert P. Parker
Bryan Newton

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

Robert P. Parker
Associate Professor
Graduate School of Education
Rutgers-The State University
New Brunswick, New Jersey
U. S. A.

Bryan Newton
Advisory Teacher For Language Developmen
St. Osyth's College
Clacton-on-Sea
Essex
England

CS204 757

WRITING IN THE LEARNING OF HUMANITIES

During the summer of 1977 (June 27-July 15), forty-nine college teachers came to Rutgers to participate in a three-week Institute: "Writing in the Learning of Humanities".* The participants, drawn from community colleges, four-year colleges and universities in ten states, represented a wide range of subjects. Though two-thirds taught English, others taught philosophy, psychology, history, sociology, ESL, reading, and political science.

The purpose of the Institute was to involve these teachers intensively in considering writing as a use of language which, by its nature, offers unique possibilities for learning in all areas of the humanities. As the faculty saw it then, and still do, writing instruction in higher education has been hampered by two traditions.

First, the task of instructing students in writing has, until recently, been delegated exclusively to English Departments in most colleges and universities. Almost never have members of other departments, even ones in which students do a great deal of writing, seen themselves as responsible for helping students improve their writing.

Second, in humanities and other courses, most of the writing students are required to do serves a testing function.

*Funding for the Institute was provided by a grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities.

That is, the writing is assigned so that teachers can find out whether students "know" certain required material (information, ideas, concepts, laws, etc.) or can do certain expected things (organize material, think clearly and logically, draw inferences or conclusions, etc.). The purpose of the writing is assessment of what has, supposedly, already been learned, not the development of "new" knowledge, insight, or skills.

We hoped to challenge both traditions by focusing initially on the second. All teachers, we assumed, are interested in their students' learning, and therefore would be open to ideas about how writing might be used more centrally and consistently to assist learning in their discipline. Further, we reasoned that deeper involvement in thinking about, assigning and responding to writing by teachers across departments would enhance not only students' learning prospects but also provide more opportunity for writing situations in which students might be helped to develop their writing abilities.

Participants were selected for their interest in writing, the excellence and diversity of their academic background, and the extent of their involvement in curriculum and policy concerns across disciplines at their college or university. The last criteria was particularly important. Our participants, we assumed, would incorporate ideas derived from the Institute in

their teaching, and, obviously, that was a primary goal. However, we also wanted participants to work actively with colleagues in their own and other departments in order to spread ideas about, and approaches to, writing as a mode of learning across the curriculum at their institutions. In this way, increasing numbers of students would have the opportunity to improve their writing by using it as a learning tool in many of their courses.

Faculty* for the Institute were selected for their excellence in teaching, their knowledge of discourse theory and of research on the composing process and composition teaching, and their familiarity with recent theories linking language, especially writing, with learning.

Each participant, when accepted for the Institute, was asked to collect samples of writing from students they were currently teaching (Spring 1977) and to send us those samples along with the assignment and their responses to the papers. We asked each participant, in addition, to keep a journal in which her/his reflections on any aspects of their classroom work on writing would be recorded.

When the faculty met for a week in advance of the Institute

*Co-directors: Robert Parker (Rutgers University) and Steven Zemelman (Roosevelt University); Lee Odell (SUNY at Buffalo); Dixie Goswami (U. of Tennessee); Martin Gliserman (Livingston College-Rutgers); Bryan Newton (County of Essex, England).

we were confronted with a mountain of student papers and several participant's journals as well as the task of translating the proposed general thematic structure of the Institute into a set of daily working plans. We worked intensively in order to feel ready to greet the participants the following Monday morning.

During that week we made several decisions about the structure of the Institute. First, we divided the faculty into three teams of two (Parker/Newton; Odell/Goswami; Zemelman/Gliserman), and the participants into three groups of about sixteen, each one balanced by region, types of institutions, and sex. A faculty team was assigned to each group, and these comprised the major instructional groups for the Institute. Second, we decided to divide four days of each week approximately in half. One half of each day would be spent in seminar sessions discussing the course books and other set topics, and the other half would be open time during which the participants could read, write, consult with faculty, or meet with each other (or with visitors to the Institute). Third, we decided to set the fifth day aside for open workshops (morning) and visiting lectures (afternoon). Faculty and participants alike could sign up to present workshops on self-chosen topics, and participants could attend as they wished.

The vast collection of student writing sent in by participants was crucial to our planning sessions. Not only did this writing firmly remind us of the realities facing college teachers, but it also enabled us to raise issues about writing from samples which came directly from the participant's teaching situations. The samples were raw and authentic - not carefully tailored selections from someone else's research or practice. After reading these themes carefully, each team selected a sub-set of about twenty papers which were reproduced for use in its group.

I. The Institute

The Institute began, then, with three groups of about sixteen participants, each with two faculty. Very soon each group developed its own unique character, and it became clear that our tentative idea that faculty might exchange groups wouldn't work. We quickly became too involved in our own groups to want to switch.

Our group must therefore be the source from which we (Parker/Newton) write, although, of course, the workshop days and the lectures were shared experiences where groups did intermingle. So were the coffee and lunch breaks. Furthermore, about half the participants lived on the campus in dorms where much discussion, reading and writing went on after hours. In fact, some of these participants felt that an important part of the

work of the Institute was only available to those who did live in the dorms.

Our group had only two "course" requirements: reading the seminar books and keeping a journal. The journal gave all of us a chance to record our thoughts and feelings about what was going on, and to reflect on daily events. We used it for planning, for taking notes, for trying to work out new ideas, and for personal commentary. We suggested to our group, also, that everyone should try to write 'poetically' - poems, stories, etc. - and a number of people did. From this writing arose two poetry workshop sessions in which participants read and discussed their own poetry. Finally, we said that while we should like to be able to read the journals, this was not a requirement; they were private and it was for the writer to decide whether he wanted to share his journal or not.

We operated our group on the principle that we should practice what we preached - which meant, really, that we shouldn't preach at all. We aimed to provide a context in which participants would take on the responsibility for their own learning and for pursuing those aspects of the work which most interested or concerned them. We did present material for consideration by the group and the set books were read and discussed, but we did not lecture or instruct. Instructors who won't instruct can be awkward to deal with. The initial result

of our approach was recorded in the newsletter produced spontaneously by participants at the end of the first week:

> By midweek we'd caught some glimpses of what was going on in the separate groups. Everyone was keeping a journal, but otherwise there was great variety. Parker/Newton conferees were drawing out deep discrepancies in attitudes towards authority and peer roles, as well as evaluative procedures.

By the end of the three weeks, however, one of the group commented in his journal: "The instructors were participants with the participants. This rapport was crucial for the group."

The samples of student writing which participants had sent before the Institute began provided a wealth of discussion and reference material. The strong concern with the evaluation of writing, which the newsletter mentioned, was one of the questions we considered. We asked our group members to place each paper (twenty-two in all, drawn from sets of writing they had submitted) in one of three piles: Good, Average, or Poor. We asked them also to note which papers they would consider to be the work of a student needing remedial help. The differences in placement of certain papers gave rise to useful discussion of evaluative criteria. More interestingly, though, the group consistently identified one piece of writing (descriptive) as the work of a competent writer and a second piece (analytical) as the work of a writer with serious problems. They were great-

ly taken aback to learn that both pieces had been written by the same student. As a result we were able to raise the important issue of viewing writing as a set of related abilities, rather than a single global ability,[1] and to discuss how these abilities vary according to the task, purpose, mode, context and audience for the writing.

Finally, we were able to raise the issue of the validity of most large-scale assessment procedures for determining the placement of freshman in composition courses. If the writing of one student could vary in quality so greatly from one piece to another, how can one writing sample in a single mode produced under test conditions be a valid or reliable measure of any particular student's writing abilities?

The workshop days and the contributions from invited speakers injected new perspectives into our group discussions. The first Workshop Day, coming only three days after the beginning of the Institute, gave faculty an opportunity to present their particular interests. After the first week there was no shortage of people electing to present sessions: the only problem was the wealth of choice confronting participants and

1. See Britton et al, The Development of Writing Abilities 11-18 (London: MacMillan, 1975) and Parker and Meskin, "Who Says Johnny Can't Write?", English Journal 65 (November 1976).

the shortness of time available. As a result, some of the workshops overflowed into times that had been earmarked for other purposes-largely personal writing and planning times. This, in turn, simply meant that everyone worked harder because they did their own writing and reading and planning after the day's session.

The workshop presentations offered new ways of looking at the composing process or at the products that resulted. A doctoral student at Rutgers[2] presented a fascinating session on "Neurological Correlates of Composing". He suggested that the two hemispheres of the brain perform different functions: the left being analytic, logical, sequential and the right being intuitive, associative, holistic. In the normal adult there is an operational shift between the two hemispheres about once a minute. If attention remains focussed for too long on either hemisphere, there is a decrease in effective functioning. Unfortunately, he said, school curricula are heavily biased towards left hemisphere activities.

One particpant's session on "Deutero-Learning: the uses of language students learn from how we teach" provided a splendid example of civil service language practice.[3]

2. Benjamin Glassner, Ed.D. candidate in English Education, Graduate School of Education.
3. Edward Rocklin.

He presented the draft of a letter by a junior civil servant which had gone through two revisions by two senior staff, the effect of each revision being to move the writing further from being personal, concrete, and lucid, and more toward being impersonal, abstract, and opaque. Together these two sessions raised sharply the political issues involved in making college students write impersonal, abstract papers.

The invited speakers also influenced the ongoing work of the Institute. Richard Larson, our first speaker, talked about models of language use and offered his own descriptive model. This talk meshed neatly with the concerns of the Institute at that point and stimulated a rash of model constructing. Richard Ohmann's talk raised radical political questions about language and society just as we were beginning our discussions of Paolo Freire's Pedagogy of the Oppressed. For us, however, the most exciting contributions were those made by Sylvia Scribner and Shirley Bryce-Heath. Sylvia Scribner, an ethnographic psychologist, talked about the social and intellectual consequences of writing by reference to her work with a West African tribe (Vi) which has no formal, compulsory education but which has three written scripts in use for different purposes. Shirley Bryce-Heath's talk on the intellectual history of writing in America presented a new view of, and a challenge to, currently accepted notions of what constitutes good and appropriate

kinds of writing. These two speakers, by approaching writing from different standpoints than those we were taking, offered us new ways to explore both the role of writing in learning and of the role of writing as a mode of communication in our own current culture.

Probably the most striking, unscheduled development to occur during the three week Institute came when participants learned of the impending site visit of an NEH evaluation team. Toby Fulwiler (of Michigan Technological University) took the lead in organizing group brainstorming sessions for the purpose of generating, collecting, and working on ideas (mainly to do with follow-up work) which would demonstrate to the evaluators that the Institute had already been a success and deserved further funding. The staff took no part in these sessions other than acting as scribes for the brainstorming groups. It was evident by this time that participants felt a strong personal stake in the work of the Institute and most were committed to further work with their colleagues when they returned to their institutions. They recognized, however, that their chances of success in these later endeavours would be much increased by contact with, and support from, other informed teachers, so funded follow-up sessions after the Institute were important to them. The newsletter reacted to the brainstorming sessions; under the heading "High Points" it reported:

> "Toby's brainstorming session was dramatic illustration of how many ideas are floating around awaiting the distilling process for better writing across the disciplines". And "All of us have the hundreds of suggestions voiced during the brainstorming... Everyone has favorites: journals, faculty discussions, team-teaching, released time for English faculty as planners, role-playing, classroom of demonstration tapes and television to show faculty, and so on..."

The driving idea behind all this effort is contained in the notion of 'writing across the curriculum' - which is a shorthand way of referring to our view of writing as a means of learning in all subjects, rather than as a means of testing. This view argues for a range of kinds of writing for a range of real and different audiences - writing as genuine communication. It also implies a view of learning which is cooperative (between teacher and student/student and student) and personal (the learner at the centre of his own learning). It also implies that knowledge is the result of the learner's own efforts in bringing new ideas and information into relationship with what he already knows; it is not the amassing of unrelated information at the dictate of some external authority (what Freire refers to as the "banking" system of education). To unite a college staff in such a view of writing and learning is a daunting task, but one which many Institute participants,

often as a direct result of their own experiences of writing and learning during those three weeks, were willing to take on. Because participants saw that this is how they learn, they felt that they had to provide the same kinds of experiences and structures for their students.

During the last week of the Institute, members of our seminar group took turns presenting particular ideas which concerned them to the rest of the group. Five members cooperated on a plan for "Writing Across the Curriculum" in their colleges. Others offered ideas for improving student writing or reflected upon forces which influence student writing. One particularly influential presentation on "Peer Evaluation of Writing: What That Shift in Audience Does" was given by Dale Yerpe (Jamestown Community College, N.Y.). Dale's students write their papers on ditto-masters so that they can all have copies of each other's writing for subsequent discussion. He claimed that this practice results in students becoming much more concerned about, and involved in, their writing; they also take more care in their choice of topic, more care about accuracy of presentation, and are more concerned to revise what they write when they know everyone will read and discuss it and not just the teacher.

As we write now our most persistent impression is of the

immense energy, enthusiasm, concern and commitment of the participants. The Newsletter for the first week reported: "Everyone we talked to was psyched up for these three weeks and the time isn't going to get away from any of us". It didn't. Some people did six week's work in those three weeks. More than that, though, they re-examined their view of themselves as teachers ("I began to look at my notions of authority, my own methods, and I found some surprises...") and thus their view of themselves as learner/teachers.

> The Institute was like a symphony, each person playing an important part. Together we had a crescendo of ideas, discussions and debate. Most significant, our deliberations caused us to think and now we will be better able to articulate those thoughts to our colleagues back home. (Newsletter, final week).

II. Since the Institute

In the year following the Institute (1977-78), most participants, by their own report, moved to implement ideas developed during the Institute. Either by oral report at the follow-up weekend in January (1978) or by letter (or both), thirty-five of the forty-nine participants have provided descriptions of the work they have undertaken as a result of the impact on them of ideas presented and developed during the Institute. Their work, which we have labelled "follow-up", can be placed in two general categories: changes in their approach to writing in their own courses, and efforts to involve local faculty, faculty

at other regional institutions, or lay people in the community in confronting, understanding and promoting the idea of writing as a mode of learning in schools and in tying school writing to writing in other areas of society.

Actually, a good many participants described a third "outcome", the effect of the Institute on their own writing. Keeping journals, writing poetry or stories for the first time in years, seeking a more personal and authentic voice for their professional articles, examining their own composing process in detail, sharing their writing in process with their students, revising more fully and thoughtfully: all these experiences have contributed to what many see as more frequent writing, more pleasurable experiences of composing, and better writing for them. They also, quite clearly and emphatically, see this heightened awareness of, interest in, and success with their own composing as directly related to their ability to help their students when they are struggling with writing tasks.

Nearly all of the participants reporting described changes in their approach to courses that they normally teach. Others described, in addition, new courses they have developed since the Institute: two on "Writing and Learning" and three on the teaching of writing - one of those for graduate students preparing to teach. Across the board, these changes included a new, or greatly expanded, use of personal journals, peer critiquing of student writing, and more attention in class to the composing process - which later resulted frequently in

the writing of multiple drafts of papers prior to any grade being assigned. To a somewhat lesser extent, these changes also included the use of free writing, "open" assignments (students free to choose their own topics), non-grading, individualized and small group instruction focused on discussions of individual pieces of writing, and reading logs. (These last are like journals in that students record their personal responses to material they are reading for the course; unlike journals the focus of the writing, required reading, is set by the instructor).

One participant, a psychology instructor, in addition to requireing journals for the first time, required his students also to write five short papers during the term.* He and other students read and commented on these papers in class, but no grades were given. Each student then selected, and revised, what he or she thought to be the three best papers and submitted them at the end of the course as a portfolio to be graded.

Here are his comments on the outcomes of these experiments.

> I felt that my knowledge of the students' work increased significantly over the term and their final portfolios were actually a pleasure to read. I had become familiar with many of their writing styles and was convinced their work was not plagiarized. They were beginning to discover a sense of their own voice...
>
> Most indicated (in their course evaluations)

*Jerome Tognoli, Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, C. W. Post College, Long Island, N. Y.

> that the emphasis on writing had had beneficial effects. Some indicated that it was the only course in which they had done any writing at all since freshman English.

Another participant, Head of the English Department at a suburban community college, described her experiments thus:**

> Since I always modify my curriculum, textbook or approach, after the inebriation of the summer I opted for variations on the Institute themes. I used journals, peer critiquing, process exercises, writing tasks. At this point, I rate my failures higher than my successes, but they are, at least, noble failures. Overall, the cause of my distress derives from a yet incomplete amalgamation of new techniques and an old self...
>
> In my experience with journal writing, for example, I was unable to devise practical ways to integrate these writings into the course and still have time for, what seemed to me, more important matters. I found students uneasy about my not reading all the entries. In turn, when I did read them, I found myself uneasy about bad writing habits that were being uninterruptedly perpetuated...
>
> I was much more successful with peer critiquing which I have always used in a minor way but this past semester turned into a vital part of the course. What I did was to design, or have the students design, a series of questions particular to each writing assignment we did. These critiques ranged from the general impressionistic responses used at the Institute ("What impressed you most?" "What would you like to know more about?") to a long checklist for writing that came from a class project, to a series of questions about beginnings, to a self evaluation sheet attached to a quick first draft...Students like

**Libby Bay, Associate Professor, Department of English, Rockland Community College, Suffern, New York.

getting and giving criticism - it helped them know one another, talk to each other, and, of course, improve their own as well as others' writing...

My second success was my biggest failure in my own evaluation of the course. Multiple rewrites gave the students the opportunity really to work at process composing, and they did exceptionally well. Students were not graded on any paper until they had copy they were pleased with. Every draft was an improvement on the previous one for just about every student so that a genuine feeling of satisfaction as well as a passing grade was achieved. This process also put editing in its proper place: last. Once the student had something worth saying it was easy to convince him/her it was worth editing. Disappointingly, however, there was no carry over from assignment to assignment: each writing task was a recreation of the wheel. With no transference from paper three to four and four to five and so on, both the students and I were in a paradoxical position by the end of the term. There was little time for rewriting the last three papers and the results were disastrous, not to mention the incongruity of the grades. I felt I could not evaluate students solely on their last drafts since in most subsequent courses they will have only one try at writing an essay. I know, from the responses I received to my oral report during the Princeton (follow-up) weekend that this situation in the minds of most Institute participants, reflects the need for a school-wide concern for writing as process, a campus-wide acknowledgement of the unique nature of each writing task, and a general faculty realization of the unreal and unfair conditions under which we make students learn.

A third participant*, teaching composition in an inner-city community college, structured a composition course for older students to emphasize the important relation of various phases in the composing process to the quality of the final product. The students kept journals in which they wrote "on a daily basis on whatever topics seemed pressing to them - about families, jobs or whatever". She looked at the journals before class meetings in brief 'mini-conferences', but assigned no grades to them.

The students also frequently wrote paragraphs in class. These were "read aloud..., discussed by the students, and not collected or graded". Finally, the students wrote nine 500-word essays on topics ranging from their attitudes toward writing, to descriptions of their neighborhoods, to a family story, to a critical analysis of James Baldwin's Go Tell It on the Mountain.

In some instances, these essays began with notes or other private jottings in student journals, were made more public and somewhat more structured in an in-class paragraph, and then developed more fully and formally in the essay. Thus, students constantly experienced a range of writing from private to public, informal to formal, and initial to

*Fay Beauchamp, Department of English, Philadelphia Community College, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. The quoted material is taken from the draft of a paper presented at the Conference on College Composition and Communication (Denver, March 1978) entitled 'Expressive to Transactional: Writing to Learn Writing".

final. They came to see that this new model of the composing process - as compared with the typical pick a topic/narrow it down/gather information/make an outline/write/edit model - not only felt more natural as a way to go about writing, but also led to more pleasurable experiences and better outcomes. It presented writing to them as a process 'which generates thoughts in ways that obviously have to be reorganized and fleshed out": recording thoughts, feelings, events, impressions informally in a journal and using occasional entries as material to be developed, in stages, into more tightly structured, polished pieces of exposition, description, narration, or argumentation - the traditional rhetorical modes. Importantly, the students received comments but no grades on any of their writing until they had completed an essay which satisfied them.

In her evaluation of the course, the instructor wrote the following:

> Attendance rates were very high - 100% was common. Two continued after being transferred to jobs away from the VA building (where the course was held). Ten of twelve finished the course and passed at the Composition 101 level. One who didn't finish was a Veteran; the other cited marital problems. Five who finished I judged as doing exceptionally well; one of the weaker students improved remarkably to a passing grade. I do think the class maximized motivation.

A fourth participant* set up a more formal experiment in order to test the hypothesis that 'revision after feedback leads to measurably better writing". This experiment, and his hypothesis, were based on three ideas discussed at length during the Institute: (1) writers learn to write by writing, not by doing exercises; (2) though the composing process seems to have general observable phases, it tends to be "as infinitely variable as are the people who write"; and (3) feedback or response during the composing process tends to help writers produce better final products.

More specifically, he wanted to test three alternate methods of giving feedback to writers in relation to the final quality of the pieces of writing. The first method involved a combination of written comments by the instructor, noting errors, but emphasizing content, with a 'Helping Circle" arrangement in which the class read and discussed each member's paper. This method was used with a paper in which the students were asked to compose a "Writing Autobiography", recalling "as much about how they learned to write as possible". After receiving instructor comments in writing and peer comments via the 'Helping Circle", students revised their papers and submitted a final version.

*Christopher Burnham, Department of English, Stockton State College, Pomona, New Jersey. Quoted material is taken from the draft of a paper presented at the Conference on College Composition and Communication (Denver, March 1978) entitled "Lengthening Student Writing: A Comparison of Four Intervention Techniques".

Students then wrote a second paper, designed to elicit less personal writing, on "The Functions of Schools". When a draft of this paper was ready, students chose whether to bring their papers to a "Helping Circle" or to be involved in a one-to-one discussion session with another student about their paper. (No one received instructor comments on this paper). Of the twenty-four students fourteen chose the "Helping Circle" and the rest chose the one-to-one feedback arrangement.

The investigator measured change in each set of papers from Version A (first draft) to Version B (final draft) by averaging, and comparing, the total number of words, T-units (main clauses, plus modifiers), sentences and paragraphs. He reasoned that the major challenge facing "basic" writers (i.e. college freshman who have difficulty writing) is the process of "stating and clarifying" their ideas about a topic, of saying enough about that topic for the reader to approach a full understanding of the writer's ideas. Or, as he put it, "any teaching technique which is going to result in my (basic) writers writing more - more words, more clauses, more sentences, and more paragraphs - is a valuable technique". The question then became: Which feedback technique led to the greatest increase in words, T-units, sentences, and paragraphs? His analysis of the papers revealed that the Instructor plus "Helping Circle" combination, used with the "Writing Autobiography" assignment, had the most positive outcomes. The

average number of words per paper increased by 1,302 from Version A to Version B, of T-units by 69, of sentences by 64, and of paragraphs by 5. The next most effective feedback technique, according to these measures, was the "Helping Circle" alone (used with "The Functions of Schools" assignment). From Version A to Version B of this paper, there was an average change of 402 words, of -5 T-units, of 4 sentences, and of 4 paragraphs. The peer one-to-one technique was least effective, leading to negative changes on two measures and minimal positive changes on the others.

Obviously, in this experiment and according to these criteria, instructor comments do make a difference, though peer feedback in groups also seems helpful. More generally, these data bear out the importance of revision to final quality, and of finding the most beneficial ways for teachers to give feedback to students.

Though these examples of classroom experiments with writing come from only four participants, they do reflect in spirit and in detail the kinds of classroom work undertaken by most of the other thirty-one participants who have reported to us. In addition, though, to changing their classroom practice, and frequently their overall roles as teachers, a smaller number of participants have reported to us about work they have undertaken beyond their classrooms in order to share their concerns about writing with others besides their students.

Fourteen participants reported initiating some kind of faculty seminar or workshop on writing at their institutions. These ranged from brief seminars within a single department to workshops of one or two days in length involving faculty across departments. In each case the intent was to involve more faculty at that institution in an intensive, ongoing consideration of the ways in which the teaching of writing might be more effectively conducted. Each hoped, as an outcome, to achieve a more unified, college-wide effort to improve students' writing than had previously been the case. In our view, these kinds of cross-disciplinary programs hold the greatest promise for bringing about real improvement in students' writing abilities. Our experience in working with secondary teachers through the "Writing Across the Curriculum Project"* underscores the benefits which accrue for students when faculty across departments in a single school address themselves to the teaching of writing - and especially with an eye toward connecting writing with learning more than with final, end-point testing of what has been learned.

Five participants also reported programs designed to address concerns that community members might share jointly with educators. For example, one participant** organized a symposium on "The Crisis

*This project, sponsored by the Schools Council and the University of London Institute of Education, ran from 1971-1976. The Director was Nancy Martin.

**Michelle Loris, Department of English, Sacred Heart University, Bridgeport, Connecticut.

in Writing: What the Public Can Do" (Fall 1977). This symposium, sponsored jointly by the Connecticut Humanities Council and Sacred Heart University, brought together university faculty, representatives of business and industry, and secondary teachers for a series of four meetings. Another participant*, with the aid of a grant from the Michigan Council on the Humanities organized a Spring Writing Symposium series (May 1978) on "Writing in the Upper Peninsula: A Community Concern". People from various areas of the Upper Michigan Community were invited to attend a series of three evening meetings which included keynote speakers from the University of Michigan, SUNY at Buffalo, and the University of Arizona, as well as workshop sessions on a variety of topics conducted by faculty from Michigan Technological University. A third participant** organized a two day Institute, sponsored by her college, on "Writing and the Community" (May 1978). Faculty from her college met with representatives from business, industry and government to discuss community demands for writing skills and the ways in which such demands might be addressed across departments within her college. In addition, she has applied to the Connecticut Council on the Humanities for a grant

*Toby Fulwiler, Dept. of Humanities, Michigan Technological University, Houghton, Michigan.

**Marjorie Rundle, Division of Humanities, Greater Hartford Community College, Hartford, Connecticut.

to support a proposed conference on literacy involving all the institutions of higher education in the Greater Hartford area, as well as a local group called "Literacy Volunteers".

The model for these particular symposia was supplied by an Institute faculty member* who was planning a three-day symposium on "Writing in Tennessee: A Community Concern" at the time of the Institute. Her symposium, held in Nashville in October 1977, was most successful, attracting representatives from the federal government in addition to people from all areas of Tennessee society.

We could report many other initiatives undertaken by participants on behalf of college-wide efforts to help students develop their writing abilities: writing handbooks, writing centers, revised assessment procedures, and so on. We think, though, that our account provides a picture of the impact of the Institute on the participants, and a sense of the general, serious concern for students' writing within, and without, higher education that our efforts have uncovered. And not only does this concern exist, but people are willing to act: to mount carefully conceived programs which address themselves to writing problems in higher education and in society at large. Most important for us, though, is the receptiveness college teachers have shown to thinking

*Dixie Goswami, Department of English, University of Tennessee.

about writing as a mode of learning, to concerning themselves with the writing process, and to integrating writing more thoughtfully into courses and programs at their institutions in the light of new theories of discourse and new evidence about how our students writing abilities can best be developed. We hope these efforts continue and that new ones are begun. We hope, also, that such efforts will be broadly supported by the colleges in which they begin, and by appropriate state, federal, and private funding agencies.

A. Required reading for Institute participants.

Emig, J. The Composing Processes of Twelfth Graders. Urbana, Ill.: NCTE, 1971

Freire, P. A Pedagogy of the Oppressed. New York: Seabury Press, 1970.

Kinneavy, J. A Theory of Discourse. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1971.

Macrorie, K. Writing To Be Read. Rochelle Park, N. J.: Hayden, 1976. Revised second edition.

Malmstrom, J. and Weaver, C. Trangrammar. Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foresman, 1973.

Martin, N., et al. Writing and Learning Across the Curriculum 11-16. London: Ward Lock, 1976.

Ohmann, R. English In America: A Radical View of the Profession. New York: Oxford University Press, 1976.

B. Optional reading for Institute participants.

Britton, J. Language and Learning. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1970.

Britton, J., et al. The Development of Writing Abilities 11-18. London: MacMillan, 1975.

Bruner, J. Beyond the Information Given. New York: Norton, 1972.

Burgess, C., et al. Understanding Children Writing. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1973.

Martin, N., et al. Understanding Children Talking. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1976.

Shaughnessy, M. Errors and Expectations. New York: Oxford University Press, 1977.